

### **REMARKS**

Claims 41, 43-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 1 – 42, 52 – 54 and 56 were cancelled previously.

In the Final Office Action dated June 14, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims**

Claims 42, 44, 48, 50, 51 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189 and Sugo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,783,608).

Claims 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189, Sugo et al. and in further view of Grant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,242,503).

Claims 43 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189, Sugo et al. and in further view of Rodman (U.S. Patent No. 3,375,933).

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above listed rejections.

The claims require a cleansing method that includes the step of providing a cleansing processing agent in a solid state which is non-water soluble. The cleansing processing agent includes a polymer having 20 to 50 mol % of acrylonitrile and 50 to 80 mol % of at least one of styrene and conjugated diene as a constituent unit.

JP 55-157604 does not teach or even fairly suggest the mol% of at least one of the styrene or conjugate diene as required by the claims. Rather JP 55-157604 teaches the wt% of acrylonitrile, which is not the same as the limitations of the claims. A prima facie case of obviousness exists when the claimed range overlaps or lies within a range disclosed by the prior

art. MPEP 2144.05. Here, no mol% range is taught by JP 55-157604. As such, the range required by the claims is not obvious.

Thus, because 55-157604 fails to teach or even fairly suggest all the required elements of the claims, claims 42, 44, 48, 50, 51 and 55 are patentable over the above cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, the rejection of dependent claims 43, 45-47 and 57 which are based in part on JP 55-157604 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 10, 2010

By: /Anne K.W. Sutton/

Anne K.W. Sutton  
Registration No. 59,592  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000